

DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT
Draft Notes
Local Advisory Council Meeting
December 17, 2002
LA SED

Purpose: To cooperate with the Local Advisory Council as the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project advances in the EIS phase.

Attendance: See attached.

Discussion:

Following introductions, Mohammed Alghurabi reviewed the agenda and asked if there were any additions or deletions. None were suggested. He then pointed to the notes of the November 7th LAC meeting and asked if there were any comments. There were none.

Joe Corradino mentioned that the scoping meeting notes were a composite of the best of the transcript as well as notes of individuals who were at the meeting. The transcript was not usable as a complete record of the meeting as there were microphone malfunctions creating large gaps in the tapes. Nevertheless, it was asked if there were any comments by the LAC of the scoping meeting notes that had been distributed in advance of the meeting. There were none. Both sets of notes will now be posted on the MDOT website.

Individual Issues/Concerns

Joe Corradino indicated that this section of the agenda had been requested by Greg Gorno at the November 7th meeting. It was Greg's position that individuals of the LAC should articulate their issues/concerns associated with the DIFT Project. Each member of the LAC was asked to participate.

Greg Gorno began the discussion by stating that he represents the trucking industry side of the DIFT proposal. He noted that he was excited about the project and believed that was also true of his colleagues in the industry. He indicated that the efficiencies created by consolidation of the railroads in one location will result in cost savings to the industry as well as reduce vehicle miles of traffic by trucks that will result in lower diesel emissions and will reduce crashes. He noted that the general public may not see these things as the industry does. But, he again stressed that the industry that he represents is very cognizant of these potential positive effects.

Carmine Palombo indicated that he sees benefits coming from the DIFT Project but that a project of this size must balance the benefits with the impacts. He noted that paving the yard, for example, will have a positive effect on air quality, especially particulate matter. He indicated that noise was an issue that needed careful consideration. He stated that SEMCOG is awaiting the results of the DIFT analysis and will continue to participate in the decision-making process, examining the positive and negative trade-offs of the proposed project.

Don Cameron indicated that he sees significant potential, both from economic and environmental standpoints, that could benefit both the community and the region as a result of the DIFT. FHWA is working with the process to see if such expectations will be demonstrated by the results of the environmental analysis.

Karen Kavanaugh indicated that her position had not changed, i.e. she has a lot of concerns about the significant impact to the local community of the proposed DIFT. She does not see the need to increase the size of existing yard, which she indicated was 300 acres, to 800 acres. She further stated the impact of 16,000 truck trips per day will negatively impact the local community. She stressed that such truck activity will diminish the local area's air quality. Her concerns also cover the development of unwanted land uses in southwest Detroit. Lastly, she indicated that she does not believe a large volume of jobs will be created and that there will be a loss of both local businesses and local tax base as a result of the DIFT consolidation proposal.

Ninfa Cancel indicated she sees no benefits to the community in any way from the DIFT. She indicated that the corporate sector only will be benefit. She noted she expected that the DIFT would create a large loss of local businesses and erosion of property values. She also stated that an increase in truck traffic as forecast will destroy the local neighborhoods. She commented that the community already has a truck road on John Kronk and if anyone wanted to know what it was like to live here, they needed to park their car on John Kronk, roll down their window, and sit there for a few minutes. Finally, she indicated she sees no positive benefits to air quality in southwest Detroit where the highest rate of asthma exists.

Kathryn Savoie indicated she believes the proposed DIFT Project, if approved, would leave many negative effects on a growing community that is recovering from the impacts of prior transportation projects initiated by the MDOT, including I-75. She noted that the local community is rebounding through improvements that it has been able to achieve, almost on its own. She cited that an eight-fold increase in DIFT trucks is a public health concern and that the diesel fumes emitted by those trucks

contain known carcinogens that lead to cardiovascular diseases. She stressed that other intermodal facilities can be used to satisfy the DIFT's purpose and need.

Marc Higginbotham indicated that his first concern was as a part owner of the existing Detroit-Livernois Yard. He noted Norfolk Southern wants to understand the extent that it is responsible for the impacts that they create as a neighbor of the local community. Secondly, he noted he has been engaged in the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project for several years and is supportive of the evaluation process that is incorporated in the environmental analysis.

Updated Approach

Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the MDOT and FHWA have been listening to the input provided by participants in the environmental process. As a result of that listening, MDOT has created a revised approach to the EIS. Mohammed Alghurabi asked Joe Corradino to walk through the process with the use of a graphic.

Joe Corradino explained that the analysis process has been adjusted so that while the first two steps which involve the Mercer work of the mid to late 90's (Step 1 on the graphic) and the Feasibility Study conducted by Corradino in 2001 (Step 2 on the graphic), that Step 3 would be modified to focus on an additional alternative known as "improve/develop existing terminals, with federal funding/oversight." He noted that this new alternative would receive the same detailed analysis, both from engineering and environmental standpoints, as the consolidation proposal will receive. He noted that in order to initiate this process, the Notice of Intent would be reissued and expanded to include the new alternative. Furthermore, he indicated that the study process would now be extended such that the DEIS would likely be available in the early part of 2004 compared to the original schedule which was to produce the DEIS in the middle of 2003.

Joe Corradino then briefly described the terminals that would be considered "existing" in the upcoming analysis. He noted that Norfolk Southern had indicated that it would consolidate its intermodal activities now conducted at the Triple Crown and Delray terminals to the Detroit-Livernois Yard. He also indicated that Norfolk Southern had already consolidated its NS/Oakwood intermodal activities at the Detroit-Livernois Yard. Marc Higginbotham confirmed both of these points. As a result, the Detroit-Livernois terminal, for purposes of the DIFT analysis, would include three Norfolk Southern intermodal operations as well as the CSX intermodal activity. The second "existing" terminal is the facility known as CP/Expressway, which is directly behind the Michigan Central Depot. The third terminal is also a Canadian Pacific operation. It is located along I-96 and is known as CP/Oak. The fourth and final

existing terminal is known as CN/Moterm which is located in Ferndale, north of 8-Mile Road. The Mazda terminal in Flat Rock is not involved as it is self-contained, i.e. serving Mazda only.

Karen Kavanaugh asked are all the terminals in Detroit. Joe Corradino indicated that three of the four are; the CN/Moterm terminal is in Ferndale, Oakland County just north of 8-Mile Road.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if Canadian Pacific owns the land at the CP/Oak terminal. Marc Higginbotham indicated that CP leases the land from CSX.

It was asked whether Canadian Pacific owns the land behind Michigan Central Depot for the CP/Expressway terminal. Mickey Blashfield, an observer in attendance at the LAC meeting, indicated that CP owns a portion of the land but leases other land from the Maroun Enterprise and from AMTRAK.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if there were more details available on the revised approach to the EIS. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that those details are not now available but would be provided by the next LAC meeting. He noted that the revised approach was being presented to the MDOT Coordination Team, the Steering Committee, and then to the LAC before the detailed work program was developed.

Karen Kavanaugh asked the reaction of members of the Steering Committee to the revised approach. Carmine Palombo, a member of the Steering Committee as well as the LAC, indicated that there was virtually no reaction, positive or negative. The only concern registered was that it was going to add more time to the process before a recommendation was made. Don Cameron, also a member of the Steering Committee, indicated that the Steering Committee welcomed the idea of doing the right thing and exploring the new alternative.

George Stern was in attendance at the LAC meeting. He represents General Motors on the Steering Committee. Joe Corradino invited him, as a Steering Committee member, to respond to Karen Kavanaugh's interest in knowing Steering Committee member reaction to the proposed revised approach. George Stern indicated that he had three points to make. First, he assured those in attendance that General Motors views itself supporting the growth and future of Detroit. He noted in recent years, General Motors built a new assembly plant in Detroit, and moved its headquarters to the Renaissance Center. In a spirit of cooperation, General Motors has furnished all desired information to the team studying the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal. But, he noted that General Motors has not tried to influence the environmental impact study process. He indicated that MDOT and Joe Corradino would be able to confirm this.

The second point George made was to explain the support of General Motors for the DIFT process. He noted that intermodal, the moving of freight in a combined highway/rail manner, is now the largest commodity moving by rail; bigger than coal, bigger than grain, bigger than chemicals. George also indicated there are many reasons for this development: branch lines are being abandoned, many industrial sidings are too short for the increased business and have curvature no longer suitable for modern rail cars, and the frequency of service at smaller rail yards is diminishing.

George Stern's third point focused on an explanation of the advantages that General Motors sees in a centralized terminal. First, a centralized terminal reduces the cost in dollars and emissions of operating to geographically-dispersed terminals. General Motors can pick up an empty trailer container when it drops off a load at a centralized terminal instead of traveling to another terminal to do so. Second, a one large terminal is more efficient than many smaller ones. There are economies to be had in supervision, locomotive switching, car utilization, clerical effort and the like. The centralized terminal can also afford to be open 24/7. The third advantage George cited for a centralized terminal is that it offers the hope that the railroads can operate joint trains, for example, Detroit-Atlanta or Detroit-Chicago, increasing the frequency of dedicated service.

George Stern noted that, at the present time, General Motors drags many trailers and containers each day to Chicago and Cincinnati to reach intermodal terminals. It also contracts for hundreds of trailers each day to be moved solely via highway. He indicated that, for all of the above reasons, General Motors supports this federal, state and local DIFT initiative to plan for the orderly development of modern, efficient, environmentally-friendly intermodal terminals capable of supporting growth, not only for General Motors but for the City of Detroit.

Joe Corradino followed George Stern's statements by indicating George was in attendance as a representative of General Motors in response to Karen Kavanaugh's request that representatives of the Big 3 participate in the LAC.

Kathryn Savoie asked George Stern if General Motors' comments today are different than when the DIFT project began ten years ago. He answered that they were not.

Greg Gorno asked about representation of the railroads on the Steering Committee. Joe Corradino noted all four are on the Steering Committee and that three of the four railroads – Canadian Pacific, CSX and Norfolk Southern – were in attendance at the last meeting. Canadian National was not.

Karen Kavanaugh asked whether the Detroit-Livernois Yard would be expanded under the new alternative. Joe Corradino indicated that the analysis to determine that had not yet been done but it was his perception that the footprint would not need to be expanded. However, he stressed that intermodal operations will likely expand to cover more of the existing terminal footprint than it does today.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if others would be included in the Local Advisory Council. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that it was expected that the LAC will be expanded to include representation of those who live/work around other terminals.

Karen Kavanaugh stressed that she would like to see more details about the new alternative and the revised approach. She noted that two of the terminals are still in southwest Detroit. She then asked whether a new scoping packet would be produced. Joe Corradino responded by saying that scoping was a continuing process and would be brought to the community and resource agencies over the next several months.

Joe Corradino then asked Karen Kavanaugh for a date and time when representatives of the DIFT Project Team may be able to discuss with CBRA its alternative. He referenced the newspaper article of December 6 that covered the press conference at which CBRA presented its alternative. Kathryn Savoie responded that nothing new was presented at the press conference as compared to previous statements on what CBRA's alternative represents. Joe Corradino indicated that it still would be appropriate for the team to meet with CBRA representatives to go over whatever drawings are available so that they have a complete understanding of the CBRA concept.

Joe Corradino also noted that, as the analysis goes forward, the forecasts of intermodal activity will be re-examined. He also indicated that the new alternative would examine individual terminals but then "roll up" (i.e., add together) their impacts in areas such as displacements, etc., to represent the totality of the new alternative.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if there were other intermodal yards in southeast Michigan than those that were described by Joe Corradino. He indicated that there were none. Marc Higginbotham also noted that, while railroads like Norfolk Southern have truck/train terminals, they are not intermodal terminals. So, he concurred that the terminals described by Joe Corradino are the only intermodal terminals in southeast Michigan.

Local Economic Area

Joe Corradino, using a graphic, indicated that a preliminary definition had been established of the local area around the proposed Consolidated Terminal alternative at the Detroit-Livernois Yard proposed for use in the economic analysis. Within this area, gains and losses in jobs, taxes, etc. would be defined. He also noted that the local area would be carved out of Wayne County so the economic impacts in the remainder of Wayne County would also be described as a separate analysis unit. Finally, in the economic analysis, the impacts in the six other counties outside Wayne County in the SEMCOG region would be defined. Finally, he noted that the definition of a local area would now be developed for the CP/Oak and CN/Moterm terminals.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that the entire Livernois-Junction Yard terminal district is not included in the local area, particularly that piece in Dearborn. Joe Corradino indicated that the area that has been defined was his perception of what representatives of Southwest Detroit would best consider as a local area. While the terminal district extends into Dearborn, that piece is not a center of economic activity. Furthermore, he believed that the area to the west of the proposed boundary (i.e., Miller Road) had both the Rouge Plant and other characteristics that significantly change the local economic issues, if they were included. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the LAC members should review the proposed local area and make suggestions for its modification.

Karen Kavanaugh asked if both sides (gains and losses) of the economic impact of the DIFT were going to be examined. Joe Corradino indicated that they would.

Name Change

Mohammed Alghurabi asked the LAC if it felt that changing the name of the project from the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal would be a good idea. There were no positive responses to the request for a name change.

Operating Procedures

It was suggested and agreed that selecting a chairperson for the LAC be postponed because the group would be expanded as a result of the revised scope and the inclusion of areas around other intermodal terminals.

Cooperation of MDOT/CBRA

Joe Corradino asked CBRA if there may be more opportunities to work together in order to establish better communication. He mentioned the meeting of CBRA dealing with property rights issues held at Logan Elementary School on November 20th as an example. He also indicated that cooperation with CBRA to bring non-profit housing organizations into a discussion would help to define how replacement housing could be secured.

Karen Kavanaugh responded that they were not for the DIFT consolidation project and, therefore, CBRA cooperation in addressing replacement housing was not likely. She indicated that the meeting on property rights issues was a positive experience and that other opportunities would be sought. She also noted how CBRA distributes notifications to those on its mailing list of postal cards MDOT provides in advance of its public meetings.

Kathryn Savoie indicated that cooperation would be appropriate in the area of air quality modeling. She asked if the DIFT Team would be willing to meet with CBRA's modeling specialists on that subject. Joe Corradino indicated that they would establish such a meeting.

Public Comments

Martha Gruelle of Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision asked whether it was correct to assume that Norfolk Southern is moving its intermodal operations from three terminals to the Detroit-Livernois Yard. Marc Higginbotham indicated that intermodal activity from the Oakwood facility had already been shifted to the Detroit-Livernois Yard and that, eventually, the intermodal activity from NS/Delray and NS/Triple Crown would be likewise shifted. Schedules for the latter are not available.

Mickey Blashfield asked what are the criteria for scoring the new alternative. He indicated that by "rolling up the data", that the new alternative was designed to fail. Joe Corradino indicated that was not the case. As a matter of fact, it was likely that the amount of intermodal activity for the new alternative, wherein consolidation does not occur, would be lower than the consolidation alternative. That may, in turn, require less land to be acquired compared to the consolidated terminal concept. Regardless, it is not appropriate to conclude that the new alternative is set up to fail.

Don Cameron responded to Mickey Blashfield's comment and indicated that the selection of a recommended alternative will not be based upon one criterion. He noted a whole range of issues will be examined.

Mickey Blashfield requested that the meeting notes be posted on the Web site prior to the LAC meetings. Joe Corradino responded that the meeting notes go through three reviews, including the LAC, before they get posted. Therefore, they are posted after the LAC meeting. Mohammed Alghurabi asked if the LAC would mind posting the notes as “draft” before the LAC meetings. There was no objection and Mohammed indicated that, in the future, the notes of the LAC meeting would be posted in draft form.

David Holtz of the Sierra Club questioned whether there was a “model” for the way that the new alternative’s impacts at individual terminals would be rolled up (i.e. added together) into a single set of impacts. Joe Corradino indicated that he knew of no railroad-related/terminal-related “model.” Nevertheless, he explained that the individual impacts of every terminal would be fully disclosed in the draft environmental impact statement. Modifications to those individual terminals was intended to satisfy the regional demand for intermodal. So, all of the impacts needed to be rolled up into a complete set of data to indicate the potential positives and negatives associated with that alternative. Don Cameron also commented that the goal of the project was to accommodate railroad activities for regional purposes. Therefore, it is appropriate to proceed in the way Joe Corradino had indicated.

David Holtz stated that the role of NEPA is to define and mitigate environmental impacts that are incurred by a proposed alternative. Joe Corradino indicated that such would occur for the new alternative for each of the individual terminals. There would be no masking of issues at each alternative. Nevertheless, in the end, the impacts in the area of potential housing and business displacements, for example, would be “rolled up” to describe the full impact of that action.

Alex Pollock asked for plans of the layout of the consolidate intermodal terminal concept. Joe Corradino and Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that such plans were being developed, but they were not yet available for review. Joe Corradino indicated that they will be described fully as the EIS process goes forward. But he also noted that there would be no labeling of the terminal area by individual railroad.

Alex Pollock asked, as a representative of a city agency, for more information about the basic issues of the DIFT. He indicated that such information was needed by all city agencies with respect to the relocation of businesses and their potential loss, if they moved outside Detroit. Sherry Piacenti indicated that it was MDOT’s interest to preserve businesses inside the City of Detroit and efforts are being made in that direction.

Carmine Palombo asked if the City of Detroit had submitted any comments officially on the scoping process. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that the matter is under coordination by Bruce King and Sarah Lile of the Environmental Affairs Department/City of Detroit. But, he noted no comments had been

received. Mohammed Alghurabi also indicated in response to Alex Pollock's remarks that the Department of Environmental Affairs hosts meetings for local governmental agencies in the region on about a monthly basis for a discussion of the DIFT with the MDOT project team. Alex Pollock was referred to people that participate in those meetings, including Bruce King and Heidi Alcock, Chuck Gullock, and the Detroit City Planning Commission.

At that point, it was decided that the next meeting would be tentatively set for January 28th at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at about 9:00 p.m.

L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\LocalAdvisory.357.doc

**Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal
Local Advisory Council Meeting
December 12, 2002**

Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT-Design
Mickey Blashfield	CENTRA
Don Cameron	FHWA
Ninfa Cancel	State Rep. Garza's Office
Marty Comer	MARS Ind.
Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group
Jeff Edwards	MDOT
Greg Gorno	Gorno Transportation
Martha Gruelle	SDEV
Jim Hartman	The Corradino Group
Marc Higginbotham	NS
Dave Holts	Sierra Club
Karen Kavanaugh	CBRA
Carmine Palombo	SEMCOG
Bob Parsons	MDOT
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT
Alex Pollock	Detroit P&DD
Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group
Kathryn Savoie	ACCESS
Chris Singer	The Detroit News
George Stern	General Motors
Doug Strauss	Benesch
Brad Van Guilder	Ecology Center
Melvin Williams	MDOT
El-hajj	ACCESS
Gail	Senator Levin's Office